

A
LETTER
TO
Mr RICHARD BAXTER
Occasioned by several injurious Refle-
xions of His upon a Treatise entituled
Justificatio Paulina.

For the better Information of his *weake* or
Credulous Readers.

By THOMAS FULLI D. D.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is first in his own Cause.*
seemeth Just: but his neighbour cometh.
and SEARCHETH Him.

OXFORD.

Printed by Hen. Hall: for John Wilmetts,
Ann. D. 1675.

173 x 13 cm.
U38p.

B

LETTER

TO

MR RICHARD BAXTER

Questioned by Special Inquiries Office
of the Department of Justice

Witness to the same

For the purpose of the same

By Thomas G. Baxter

Witness to the same

Witness to the same



M^r BAXTER,

I have latelie from three several publicke messengers of yours (the later treading still upon the heels of the former) received your expected Salutations: all of them much resembling Ahimaaz, both for the swiftness of their pace, and that they had nothing to say when they came. The two first indeed approached me as if they had a mind to lye Incognito's, for they took up their lodgings where none would enquire for them; the one in a little corner of a Preface to M^r Danvers, the other in the wide open field of your Catholicke Theologie, where yet he stood plac'd so cunningly, that a man might traverse about three parts of that large *Champion*, before he could gaine the Satisfaction to see him. Your 3^d. is of a freer Conversation, and though He brought the face of warr with him, and seem'd to threaten much, yet I found him civil and good natur'd, and he went off fairely without doing any harme. In your Preface to M^r. Danvers, I am beholding to you for the trouble you have sav'd me of transcribing that very little I have of your *new Original Sin*. v7:

2. Sum. 18. 19.

Preface to two
Disput. about
Orig. Sin.

Unum vero prætereundum non cenſeo &c. p. 2. only I beg your leave to English it for the ſake of your un-latine Readers, and thus it ſounds. *One thing I judge ought not to be wav'd, which is a novelty amongſt the neweſt (though it may ſeem a little more remote from the Argument before Us) that the Preface (I know not by what fortunate Mercury) has found Us another Original Sin of a much later Date then that which claims from Adam. O blind Divines who ever went before ! This is my charge, and the whole of it to a word, which I intreat the Reader (for his better ſatisfaction) to keep carefully in his mind.*

Now, Sr, that I doe not prævaricate or miſ-report you in a ſyllable, your Selfe I doubt not will be my Compurgator in your PREFACE to a Treatiſe of another mans concerning the nature, Ends, and Difference of the two Covenants. Your words are theſe, *moſt writers, if not moſt Chriſtians, doe greatly darken the ſacred Doctrin by over-looking the Interſt of children in the Actions of their neerer Parents, and thinke they participate of no Guilt, and ſuffer for NO ORIGINAL SIN but ADAMS ONLT.* Any that is not blind (and underſtands the language) may ſee I faſten upon the laſt claufe alone, the new Original SIN, I meddle with no other INTERESTS of Children; this is the All of my charge, A new or (as you pleaſantly call it) a SECONDARY Original Sin, that is, a ſecondary firſt of All.

Now let us compare your Answer, which in the

the same Preface is clearly to this effect, that I charge you only for holding *some* guilt of children in their nearer Parents sins. For although in the close of that period you shuffle in your *secondary Original Sin*, that comes in but by the *By*, not as any words of mine but as an *Ex abundanti*; a private whisper of your own, where it would not by All be so easily minded as any Part, much less as the whole of my Charge.

I appeale now to your selfe, whether this was done as a faire ingenuous Antagonist, or to use your own words, as an *Impartial Friend of sacred Truth who is above the Dominion of Carnal Interest, faction, and false prejudice; and is cur'd of the malady of presidence, hasty Judging &c.* Will any unbiass'd Reader think you have done me right here, and not rather be tempted to beleive you sought a Quarrel? you should have prov'd that some before your selfe had own'd another Original Sin, and that under the very terms (for I doe not desire you should give your self the trouble to make any *Consequences* for my use) instead of which you present me with *some Interest* of children in their Parents Sins, which neither I nor any Body Else I know off denies as to the thing, though as to the *Extent* and other circumstances all are not agreed, and you may in that enjoy your Opinion for me. Sr, Austin has a sharp rebuke for him, *qui verba supprimit questionis*, and bids us have an eye to him, but I forbear.

*Dedic. before
the Pref of
Orig. Sin.*

You goe on there to tell your Reader (I would hope not to expose my Ignorance) I know not your new Original Sin was Austins judgment, and many other antient and modern writers: wherein you have done me but right, for indeed I did not know it, and despaire I ever shall; but more of that anon!

You might have spar'd your objecting the Litany against me with i'ts flourish, that *I am less for it then you*, which is another peece of newes to me. I admire the mystery so much the more for the notable *proofs* you have annexed to perswade me and others to beleve it, viz: because you pray heartily. Remember not Lord our offences &c. Good Sr what would you have me to subsume? I can find nothing but this hard chapter; that I am not so happy as to pray so heartily &c. Ergo you are more for the Litany then I. Who will be able to stand before you, if you fight with such weapons as these? I have heard of some *weake* or *unquiet* men, whose fancies or ferments have found in this passage of the Litany a way to Purgatory, but never any till now that discoverd by it the *Nova Atlantis* of a new Original Sin. Why was I not as well attaqu'd with the second Commandment? what need of going any farther?

In the close of the same.* Preface you promise us *fuller satisfaction* to both these points, *Justification* by works, and the *Secondary Original Sin*. Truly, Sr, I crave your pardon, if I thinke your fullest Satisfaction would be a full entire *Retraction*.

* To Mr Dan-
WETA.

tion of both; of the latter, as you give it the new stamp of another Original Sin; farther I am not engag'd at present against it. 'Tis a pity but those good words of yours should be turn'd into Real *Actions*, where you profess your readiness to buy the Truth at a dearer Rate *Appeal to the Light. p. 4.* then the Recantation of your Error. O for more Austins, more Exemplars of that admirable modesty, which enamell'd all the Gold in his other excellent writings: more of that generous Love to sacred Truth, which should make us lay all our poor concerns and reputations at it's feet, and value one *Euge* of a good Conscience above all the shouts and acclamations of a Triumph. But alas, Sr, how faintly such heroicke selfe-abasements are to be expected your selfe have taught us in remarkable words. I like them so well, that I hope the Reader will not think them unworthy my transcribing. If (say you) you have a Friend that errs, whose recovery you desire, be sure you write not a Confutation of his Errours, for ordinarily that's the way to fasten them in him, and to make him worse. Some will think this is a hard Censure to pass upon learned Godly Men. But there's no reasoning against Common unquestionable Experience. Of all the Cartloads of Controversial writings that swarm in the world how many can you name that convinc'd the Antagonist, and brought him to a Recantation? And anon, As soon as you speak to men in

Disput. 5. of
Right to sacra-
ments. p. 481.
482.

the hearing of the World, they presently apprehend their Reputation to be so engaged, that they are excited to defend it with all their might, and instead of an impartial Consideration of your Arguments, and a ready Entertainment of the Truth, they bend their Wits to study how to make good what once they deliver'd, THAT THE WORLD MAY NOT THINKE THEM SO WEAKE AS TO HAVE MISTAKEN. Nay, they who doe PROFESS TO LOVE THE TRUTH as Truth, yet this SELFE is so near them and so potent with them &c. Words full of truth with the sad experience of all Ages to confirm them: and you that have given us the Advice have a particular obligation to observe them punctually for your selfe upon all occasions. But, Sr, to deal plainly and Christianly with you, 'Tis not only my own fear, but of divers knowing persons, who pretend (at least) to be your very *Friends*, and to have a fair Respect for your Parts and sincerity, that you fall too near the reach of the description, you here give of others. I have a particular reason to fear it. A great Outcry you have made of Me, as chargeing you with things you have *retracted*; which, if true, I hope is no inexcusable crime on my part, for I'm sure it will amount to no more than a fault of unwillfull Ignorance. I knew not it was my duty to read all the books your fruitfull pen has brought into the world, much less to look for *Retractions*, where I had no Encouragement to Expect, nor any Inscription of your numerous Treatises hinted the least

least promise of so noble a self-denial ; and let me assure you I have not been negligent in my Enquiries of those that might know better than my self, what you have retracted : All I have met with profess to be as ignorant as my self of this. Your very late Preface to the Discourse of the two Covenants shews us little of Retraction.

And to come closer to you, if I have wrong'd you in this matter (as you allwaies charge me) what's the reason you have not hitherto directed us to the particulars of your Recantation , *what, when, where ?* but throw a *general* roving Accusation against me without offer of proof. You direct me indeed to a small Book above twenty years ago (as you say) retracted, Preface to the two disput. of Orig. Sin, p. 44. I suppose you mean your Aphorisms (the most scholar-like and elaborate (though erroneous) Book in Controversy you ever compos'd, excepting it's numerous Oracular Dictates) and thence Appeal especially to your *Disputations about Justification*, and some others. But truly, Sr, I cannot trudge up and down to every place you would send me, my legs at present are too weak. Had you a mind to satisfy your Reader, what would it have cost you to save him a labour with one point of your finger to the particular places ? All I can pick up of any seeming *Retraction* (where I have happen'd to be) is that you some where say (after your wary deliberate manner) that works are necessary AT LEAST to the Continuation of Our justification. But, Sr, A T
LEAST

LEAST sounds no *alteration* of Judgement but an *Hesitation*, or *suspension* at most: nor have you me for your Antagonist in that (*sans sens*) in the known *Reformed* notion. Our Question, Sr, with your good leave (disguise and darken it as you please) is not what is necessary to the justified Person, or to the *continuance* of his Justification, but what to the *primary Justification* it's self, in which if you disclaim your *Works*, the Controversy will shrink into a narrow point, and then you may in time be oblig'd to unravell all your entangled Threds of Justification again, & come to the Penance of speaking as your Neighbours doe.

Only you cannot blame me if I wish you would goe about your farther explanations to some better purpose than hitherto you have done, that you would not raise clamours of being *grossly misrepresented* by me, for I doubt all the *gross Misreports* will come to some other door at last, that you would make good your smooth suggestion, that such *Teachers* as oppose you think that *Agreeing Men* (in these points) *are not agreed*: In short that in a few *plain undisguis'd* words, you would let us know where We are agreed, and where not, and deliver your Reader from the Jealousy you have rais'd that there is no such Agreement. So that if the fear be just and true He may not be surpriz'd; if false he may give it over. *Siverus, Ne oppri-*

Cic. in Catil. mar, sin falsus ut tandem aliquando timere desinam.

I have done with your first Attacque, and proceed to the next in your CATHOLIQUE THEOLOGY, fol. 255. There it seems you are pleas'd again not only to arraign and condemn me for my Doctrine, but to put me also in the Cubb with divers mean and contemptible *Malefactors*, such as wild *Saltmarsh*, *P. Hobson*, and the *Marron* of *modern Divinity*, whose Author (out of great *kindness* no doubt to some body) you industriously tell us in the margin, *is reported to have been an honest Barber*; a note which many think you might have spar'd as well as any that ever traded so busily in Controversies of Religion; Thus you think fit to mark out my poor name to Posterity.

But, good Sr, one word with you before we goe off from this suggestion so full of *Truth* and *Civility*. Had you no other names in your memory, had you not many scores of *greatest Eminence* and repute in the Christian World of the same Judgement with me, that you could find no better Fellows for me then such as these? Know you not I speak the same thing with all the Reformed Churches (where they have occasion) and generally with all the Old Reformed Writers? This sure would be too gross an Imputation of *Ignorance* to a Person of your *Parts*, *Fame*, *Industry* and *Reading*. Do you know it? Then you have made me Reparation enough by joining me in that very *scandalous* Reflexion with such numerous *Worthies* as those. For shame

let it be no longer *Dr. Tully, Saltmarsh, &c.* But *the Church of England* with all the rest of the *Reformed*, and their severall old renown'd Writers; these be your *Hobsons*, your *Saltmarshes*, and your *Barber-Scriblers*. I am heartily sorry you have forc'd me to be so plain with you; had not such names and so many of them been embargu'd with mine in that odious Insinuation I could have turn'd it into meer *Digertisement* (for otherwise it could deserve no farther notice) But as it is you may well allow me to question by what *Spirit* you thrust that Paragraph into your Book, and to believe no protestation *Contra Factum* will buy such a not guilty to

I must not wave the Character you there give your Readers of me and the *Honest Barber &c.* viz. where you admonish them that *such Writers in their learned net-work Treatises (being wise in Orthodoxy overmuch, entangled and confounded by incongruous notions of man's Invention) are liker to entangle and confound &c.* What learned *Net-work Treatises* some of those names were ever gall'ty off, or what fowl they caught by their *Net-work* but *Widgones &c.* I know not. But let any man seriously peruse your own controversial writings in these points, and 'tis not improbable but (as in Anselm's dream) he will find all overspread with *Nets*, so many *Windings in and out, off and on, this way and that way, such clouds of Noxal Distinctions, Preambles, Limitations, &c.* such wheelings and lines of Circumvallation

vallation at a modest distance about the *Question*, and *saunt uncertain* Approaches to it, that to my knowledge divers who wish you well have sadly complain'd of it, and profess your fuller Explanations (as you call them) have but bewildred them more, and sent them away with less satisfaction than they came unto them. You will not, I hope, account me your Enemy for telling you the truth, and yet, so I may do you good, pass what judgement of me you please, it matters little.

And now, Sir, to your large PREFACE before your *Disput. of Original Sin*, all which you have frankly bestow'd on me, but with such an unfortunate mistake, we are neither of us the better for it, I have no profit, and you no credit by it. For though you charitably intend something for my satisfaction, 'tis all lost in your speaking *nothing to the Question*. You may remember, Sir, (what stands visible to every eye) that I charg'd you only with your *new Original Sin*, *deriv'd from Adam*, *unknown, unheard of* before in the Christian World, and which therefore I thought well deserv'd the *Exclamation*, which so pains you, *O cæcos ante Theologos &c.* To this your Preface has not one word to the purpose, nothing in all your quotations, that I laid to your charge, of which more anon.

But because you give us *Preface upon Preface*, a medley of things that have no great coherence with your main design (to smooth, I suppose,

your way to some of your more Innocent, but credulous Readers.) I must attend your Motions.

And first of all I cannot but approve your Note concerning Good Intentions; that *They will not justify our Errors*, and that by our bold hasty Judgements of those things We never well digested, or understood; we do but bring Our selves into a suspicion; Our Understandings are none of the largest size; or plainly to that affect. Only your Remarque in my Judgement had been more compleat with the Addition of that rational Sentence in the Law, *Magna Negligentia est lata Culpa*. Our hasty when Willfull and Excessive, may justly bring Our Morals into question too. For willfull ignorance has ever been accounted somewhat more than a fault of the mind and Understanding.

Now, Sr, can you endure a little plain dealing from a friendly Antagonist? Do you think your good Admonition has no Aspect upon your selfe? would God it look'd not so full upon you. I appeal to your own Conscience (as well as the Readers judgement) whether of us two be deeper in the Guilt of bold and hasty Judging; you that in your single-leekie Brigandine dare set forth with so high a sail against wind and tide to brave all the Reformed Churches &c. Or I who content my self to cast my Anchor by theirs upon the Faith and Doctrine which was once deliver'd to the Saints; trembling at a thought of exalting my self above so many Worthies at whose feet it would more become you

you and me to sit with Reverence, than to be thus
 Belting at their Heads, and dragging them by the
 hoary hairs, as a *spectacle* and a *By-word* to all
 You know, Sr, (at least give others leave to think
 they doe) what *Armies*, of what *Strength* and *Quali-
 ty* appear in these Battails against you; and that
 through such poor Names as mine, you *defy* and
 wound them; you may hear more anon.

Yet see therefore no cause as yet to repent me of
 calling (as you say) to the *Academicall Youth* (to
 all indeed) that, as they love the knowledge of the
Truth, they take You not for an Oracle in your
bold dividing singularities. I bless God I can with
 a clear Conscience call upon them again and again
 to do so.

Next you fall upon that obvious *popular* Topick
 of each Parties bidding their Fellows beware of the
 other, *Papists*, *Protestants*, *Lutherans*, *Calvinists* p. 5. 6.
 &c. Of which the natural Inference must be this;
Ergo my Admonition (or any other man's of the
 like nature) concerning Your self is not to be
 heeded. Might not the false Teachers in the
 Church's Infancy have us'd the same Plea for them-
 selves to the many Caveats put in against them by
 the Apostles? Or were those Caveats to be blasted
 as *Phantasms* or *Melancholies* (in your own Cour- p. 51.
 teous Phrase)? Or were the faithfull Admonitors to
 withdraw their good Counsels upon *Fear* that such
awakening Topicks should be brought against Them?
 nay does any man practice what you here condemn
 more than Yourself? As particularly You have lately

treated me in your foremention'd *Catholic Theology*, where you expressly dissuade your Readers to be instructed by Mr. or *Salmastus* &c. lest they be led into Error & Truery; Sr, I wonder what opinion you have of the Age you live in (for *Petrus a platerierum*) to think such little *wiggles* and *Evasions* with pass for rational Discourse; nay that even your frequent *Self-assertions*, though in the open view and light of the Sun; shall sink away unobserv'd.

You say well p. 5. that it is not the part of a good man to set Churches together by the Ears, and to make People believe they differ where they do not. If this be design'd (as no doubt it is) for the Teachers of Justification by Faith without works, I pray what Churches are by this Doctrine set by the Ears together & not the Reformed sure, for, as I have shew'd you elsewhere, they are of one lip and double of one Heart too in the Point, with both against your own make-bate *Novelties*. What other Societies of men you can take in, except *Papists*, *Soci-nians*, or of late the *Quakers*; I understand not. And would you have us yield up the great Truths of the Gospel for fear of offending such *Church-shippers* as these? In the mean time, Sr, You may do well to consider who began the Fray, and how much easier 'tis to begin one, than to end it. Next you proceed to some grave Advice commended to our Acceptation from the Test of *much*, and so much Experience of your own; and that in effect is not to conclude difference in Doctrine from different

different Terms, Orders or Methods of Expression;
 differing of Conceptions, &c. and withall give us
 timely notice you are resolved to the utmost of
 your skill and opportunity to understand them, that
 think a different name or Method is a different Do-
 ctrine. And 'tis a very Charitable undertaking
 where ever such sad creatures can be found, who
 know not the *Same Thing* may be expressed in Dis-
 ferent Names or Languages. *But* *let's fall a selfe* *closer to our*
Business, speak in good sadness: would you not
 have your friends with the *Glib* *smooth* conclude
 upon this Admonition, that all the Difference
 betwixt you and the Concoction of the same Judg-
 ment in the point of Justification is merely Ver-
 bal, nothing but a strife about Words and Forms
 of Expression; and that in the *Maine* we have a
 great Discrepancy, I think you would. But
 not so fast, Sir, my weak legs cannot bear your
 company at this rate. What? Perfect Contradiction
 no more than a Difference in words? Faith alone,
 and not Faith alone, Faith *with* and *without* works;
 one and the same thing? Excuse me during a here. I
 see it is not for nothing that so an Objection is
 gainst your Doctrine as *Papist*, you return this
 Heroique Answer, *FRIGHTEEN NOT IN ME*
WITH THE NAME OF A PAPIST, when
I speak the Truth. But seems you would be taken
 for a stout *Protestant* and so your friends. All no
 doubt in the Point before Us is as much *Legit-*
imately with which no Man of Mettle ought now
 to quarrel.

to be frighted, though Our *White-liver'd Progeni-
tors in the Reformed Churches* durst not take the nose
so high. *But of his holiness they say nothing*
Sr, you have taught me to guess What Answer
you would return to This; which very likely
would be to this effect. What? would you have
me frighted from owning a Truth because a *Pa-
pist* owns it? Then I must not believe there
is a God or a Jesus &c. And so on for two or
three pages together. *Is this Doctrine fit for an
Academical Doctor, and a Master of a literate so-
ciety?* And having run on a while so pertinently
and withall so modestly then wo to some. Sr,
most if not all the Differences betwixt Us and
the *Romish Church* were ever held (with your
good leave) by as wise and learned Protestants
as ever you or I are like to be for more than
Twisting of words; and above all in the *Article
of Justification*; which you seem to place amongst
your *Logomachies*; or *Logicall notions*. Let any
discerning Reader compare the 48. Sect. of this
Preface with the words in p. 5. of your *Appeal
to the Lights*; and tis likely he will concur with
men (for him be never so *Merry*) in that *Melan-
choly Phantasmor Fear*. For tis worth the noting
how in that *dark Appeal*, where you distinguish of
Popish points; i. e. some where the Difference is
irreconcilable; others in effect but in words. We
have no direction upon which Rank we must be-
flow *Justification*; nothing of it at all from you;
Name or Thing. But *why*; next to the allseeing
God, you should know best your self. Sr,

[Pref. p. 52.]

Sr, pile one *Distinction* or *Evastion* upon another as long as you please, as many severall *Faiths*, and *works*, and *Justifications* as you can name, all this will never make the *two Poles* meet, your Doctrine I mean of Justification with that of the *Reformed Churches*. But seeing you are so busie in turning Our greatest Controversies with the Papists &c. into a *childish* Contest of words; to undeceive some of your Readers, who dream of no harm from such a Name as yours (but in the *simplicity* of their hearts go along wherever you lead them) we must give it a little farther Examination. And a little will serve the turn.

Words, Sr, as they are enfranchis'd into *Language*, are but the Agents and Factors of *Things*, for which they continually negotiate with our minds, conveighing errands upon all occasions from one soul to another. Whence it follows that their *Use* and signification is *unalterable*, but by the stamp of the like *publick Usage* and Imposition from whence at first they receiv'd their being, and therefore (if I may here accommodate the holy phrase) of *no private Interpretation*. What all others call a *Tree* you must not call a *Stone*, and pretend the difference is but in a *name* or *Words*. For although the same thing may be sufficiently represented by different words, 'tis only when they are *synonymous* and agreeing in sense; It cannot be otherwise, no more than a *Stone* can be represented to the eye by the Image of a *Tree*.

Now as keeping close to this common Usage of words is necessary in all affairs of humane life, 'tis so especially in the concerns of Faith and Religion. 'Tis not sure for nothing that Paul advis'd Timothy to hold fast the FORME of sound words, *non solum quoad substantiam, sed quoad ipsam orationis figuram* saith Calvin. For (as the wise and learned Melancthon has minded us well) *Amisâ verborum proprietate, quæ rerum notæ sunt, alias confingi res necesse est.* That is, when once we lay aside the propriety of words, which are the notes or Symbols of things, We pass undoubtedly to the minting of new Things themselves. The old Primitive Doctors and Churches were sufficiently aware of this, and therefore would not dispense with the Intrusion of one iām (much less of one novel word) in any Article or head of Faith, where Custom and the Usage of the Church had authoriz'd another. And this they did upon the great and cogent reason Melancthon gave us but now, *vz.* because they were not to learn that such as thought with the Church, would be content to speak as she did, and that the Contrary Practice never boded good to the Unity, Peace, and Doctrine entrusted to her care: Of which I think we of this Age have had Instances enough amongst our selves to our cost: so that (to return your kindness) *It is not the part of a Good man to set Churches by the Ears together, and to make Our silly Credulous Admirers believe that the Vast*
gulf

2. Tim. 1. 13.

Prefat. in
Luth. Op. Tom.

2.

7

gulf which was ever fix'd between Us and the severall *branded Corrupters* of the Truth is now so neer upon the close that if a man do but *goe back* a little to take his feeze, he may easily jump over it. Nor is it the part of a *wise Teacher* to think himself, that Men are agreed, where every eye may see them dealing *blowes* and *Deaths* about.

As for the Difference of *Method*, *Ordering*, *Digesting* and *expressing* our *Conceptions* (of which you seem to make little account in Comparison) I know not yet how far you may stretch your *Order* and *Method* of conceptions; whether you speak of that order which is no more than a *beauty*; or *Circumstance*; or would draw it out to All indefinitely, and so leave nothing but *deformity* and *Confusion*. A child may be born with all the *parts* and limbs of a *perfect* man, yet if not plac'd in their rank and *Order* may be a prodigious *Monster*: and a Book may want ne'r a letter of the Alphabet (and all repeated many thousand times over) yet not contain a word either of *sense* or *Language* for want of *Order*.

Thus *Papists* and *Protestants* are agreed about the *necessity* of good works, yet the *difference* is much wider than you seem to make it, because both do not *rank* that necessity alike; the one stretching it to the *first* *Justification*, the other not, but confining it to it's proper *Rank* and *Province* of *Inherent* holiness, where it

ought to keep. So that upon so *crude* and *generall* an Admonition about different *Names*, *Words*, *Orders*, and *wayes of Expression*, your *weaker* Readers had need beware that instead of instructing you do not *entangle* and confound them.

Next, Sr, you are pleas'd to turn something out of your way to a pleasant Discourse about *Melancholy* and it's ill effects, perhaps to drive the pernicious humour from all your Readers by your odd introduction of it there (with it's handsome Attendants) as Heraclitus was cur'd of his, *pro tempore*, by a not extreemely differing Rencontre.

I have now done with that part of your Preface, which you have wasted upon your *Secondary Orig. Sin*.

But you have one word with me more, and I'm glad it is but one, for such sad work as this might afflict a more *Athletique* constitution then mine; and in earnest I somewhat wonder how you held out with it your selfe, it must needs make any man *sick* at the heart.

And now the heavens are on a sudden all cover'd with black; a storm is coming, to which the former was but a brisk musical gale. Lets looke to our tackling.

Cap. 11. In my *Justif. Paulina*, I had made two civil requests to you, the one *Probat. te excutias*, that you would well examine and sift your selfe before God and your own conscience, whom you especially design. by that ONE Person, who alone

stone (upon supposal of difference) is to be followed before all Dissenters in the matter of Justification , according to your 42. Direct. for the *Cure of Church Divisions*. My other suit is in these words , *Diligentiùs apud se perpenderit &c.* That you would diligently consider the great Affinity your *Justification* has contracted with the *Popish*.

Now let the Reader well observe how you manage this part of the Battail ; and thence take his measures of your *skill* and *dexterity* in *Controversal* Engagements. Let him take notice first where and how you begin , with a meer *catch* at the word [*Diligence*] to let us know what a *hard Student* you have been in your time. P. 44
Your Call for Diligence. (say. you) tells me you know me not , who have little spar'd for labour these 37. years , and I am now unfit for increased diligence ; and this is all we have to that Concern.

I pray , Sr , did I ever tax you (*directly* or *indirectly*) with sloath in your *Studies* ? and yet do not you suggest unto your Reader I do ? And shall we call this *Sincerity* ? my desire was you would take your *Ballance* and weigh more *diligently* , that so you might see the very small odds betwixt your *Justification* and the *Council of Trent* ; for to me neither of them turns the scale upon the other : I spake of no pains or labour , but only a more diligent *Consideration*.

For give me leave , Sr , by the by to mind

you, that much *reading* and *tumbling* of Books contains not all the necessary ingredients of an usefull Schollar, no more than the thrusting down of meat in abundance to the Stomach makes a strong or healthfull Body. If we will have good *bloud* and *nutriment*, strong *Nerves* and bones for action, after the best *choyce* of our meat, we must allow nature her due periods of *Concoction*, otherwise all will be but unperfect or hurtfull chyle. 'Tis Meditation, Sr, which is the *Stomach* of the mind, *weighing*, *sifting*, and *reflecting* upon what we reade: in which if there happen to be an errour, either in point of diligence, or judgement (as too often there does) no after-concoction will make amends; All will be *Cruditie* and *Contagion* still.

But now (if you please) to our business of *Justification* (for you know well enough my words refer only to that) you say you will not *summon me before God*, or *Conscience*, but *what will the world thinke of my dealing*, to bait, and that by gross MISREPORTS, a small Booke, above twenty years RETRACTED.

Sr, I gave you no *Summons*, but a *Friendly Admonition* (as all the world may see) and I here do it again. I have MISREPORTED you in nothing, much less GROSSLY (let your friends themselves be Judges) I know of no RETRACTATION you have made to this day, notwithstanding all my diligent enquiries of Persons that are well acquainted with
you:

you : no one Booke under that title (which yet would have been no disgrace to so good a worke) no talke of RETRACTATIONS till I had printed my Booke , and that only from your Selfe , no direction from you either what you have *retracted*, or where we may find it since ; which is yet the more amazing, because in your first complaint of this matter, p. 4. you tell us of about SIXTY Books of Retractions (in part at least) you have writ, and blame me for passing them All by without observation : I envy not the readines and fecundity of your Pen ; but you seem a Pretender to Cryptography in writing what few Eyes (if any) besides your own can read. Well, when we see these fam'd Retractions, we shall take our measures accordingly.

But, Sr, for your Own, your Readers, and the Truths sake, I beseech you take care we have no *Retraction* of those yet *invisible Retractions*, and that you no where *contradict your selfe*.

Sr, the world will expect some *clearer* and more *ingenuous* satisfaction from you (at this time of the day) then to be wheedl'd with bare *Talks*, and complaints of gross MISREPORTS, where none at all appears. And truly, Sr, I give you this Admonition as a *Friend*, for otherwise I needed not.

Next you surprise me with a pretty Question, *why I turn a Logical case of Defining into a Theological de Re*, and we heare of this new quirke p. 45.
of

of *Defining* from you more then once, and 'tis All your own fruitfull Invention, *Justitia Christi Imputata* is one thing. (say you) and the Definition of *Justice* or *imputation* is another. Of *Justice*, or *Imputation*! I take [OR] Sir, to be a *Disjunctive*, not a *Copulative*, and so 'tis a plain *Fallacy of Division*, which any young *Logick-Smatterer* would tell you. Who knowes not that the *wall* is one thing, and the *whiteness* of it another, and so must have their Definitions *a-part*; but, good Sr, is the Definition of a *white wall* another thing from a *white wall*? then it is no good Definition, and our Plea now is not about *false Definitions*, but what are suppos'd (at least) to be *True*; about Definitions *indefinitely*, for there lies your *Novell Instruction*.

Justice, Sr, is one thing, and the *Imputation* of it another. but *Imputed Justice* cannot differ from it's true Definition, unless you will have it to differ really from it's selfe. Here then we have a transparent *Fallacy*.

You go on, and ask me *if in good earnest I am desirous to know whom you meane*, and there you stop. Your question is imperfect and speakes out no sense. Mine is plainly this, whom you meane by that ONE Rare Person, whose single Judgement is (upon Difference) to be prefer'd, in the Point of *Justification*, and to whom; *Quem quibus in Doctrina Justificationis anteponat*. You need not doubt but that I am in earnest here, for I am ambitious of his Acquaintance. Now let's attend your Answer
(and

(and I earnestly desire the Reader to observe it throughout.)

Why, first *Pagnine*, *Buxtorf* &c. are very good *Hebraicians*, *Dr. Pocock* is good for the *Arabique* (He is so to a great *Eminence* in that, and many Languages (with store of other good learning) besides, to say nothing of his rare Christian *vertues*, the Crown of all.) *Dr. Wallis* for a *Geometrician*, (and so he is in many singular endowments and abilities besides.) *Dr. Willis* in *Physick*, and so on. These, and such like *Excellent* men, are to be prefer'd in their way, before such as never studied those sciences (a slender commendation for so eminent and worthy Persons!) A whole Page and a halfe consum'd in this ramble. But now at last you will fall to the point, and tell me their names, who are better *Definers of Justification, Faith, and Imputation, and have deliver'd us far more judicious, and digested thoughts of these things then my self.* Indeed! your servant, was that ever any Question of mine! And is this all you have to say in the matter, and in the audience of the world too? not one syllable more. To save you farther labour, I yield to all the worthy persons you have nam'd (excepting only your own *Disciples*) I am not worthy to be compar'd with them. I desire no man (young or old) to prefer me before my *Betters*, least of all when I am singular, and walke alone.

P. 47.

But, Sr, with your favour, this will not do your work; we must have some other account of *quem quibus*, then what you have given us yet. I shall

I X O

D

take

take leave to present our indifferent Readers with a more *ingenuous*, and *truer* state of the Question, *far* more suitable both to my *plain* meaning, and the clear purport of your own *direction*. Let the case be this. There is ONE, who of late has rais'd much dust amongst us about the grand article of *Justification*, whether it be *by Faith without works*, or *by Faith and WORKS* too. All our old renowned Divines on this side, and beyond the seas, are unanimously agreed that *Justification* is by *Faith alone*, i. e. without *Works*. This ONE Person has often published his Judgement to the contrary. The matter is of very great concern by the confession of both. So that a poor *Academical Doctor* may very rationally enquire of you, who in this case is to be preferr'd; That ONE, or those *Many*. If that ONE, then I am almost brought to the Person I fought for; and why should he be so bashful to be willingly *conceal'd*? nay, why so injurious to the *Publique*? 'Tis true it would be some small reflexion upon those innumerable worthies who have gone before him, such as our *Jewel, Rainolds, Abbot, White, Field, Whitaker, Perkins, Andrews, Davanant, &c.*

But *Truth* is *Truth* still, and men must not be over *modest* in it's cause, and why may not ONE *Lyneus*, that can see through a stone wall, discover more then a thousand that cannot? But now if I am not to goe along with him, then I am left still to herd it with the illiterate *Rulers* and *Majority*: and if this be my duty, why should not that

ONE.

ONE encourage me by his *Example*? nay suppose he is upon all occasions (as openly as he yet thinks fit) perswading me, that they are more worthy to be directed by him then he by them. To some such case as this, Sr, I expected your Answer, and not a needless insignificant scorn of my poor ideas yours in the cause of so great a Truth.

There remains yet one small *sub-question*, and then I am quit at present from the *tedious* task I ever yet undertooke. You desire me to tell you, *whether I differ from you in the rule of counsel, which you there gave your ignorant people or no.*

Sr, our young men in the *University* call this a *Fallacy of several questions in one*. Your direction is built of various materials and several appointments, some of which I like well enough, others not. I am only concern'd (as the *blind* may see) about your matters of *high and difficult speculation* in the close of your direction, wherein you would have that ONE man to be prefer'd before all the rest. Amongst those in the *Application* of your rule you place the *Definition of Justification* (i. e. *undeniably* for all your *mincing*) the *Thing* it self).

Now Sr, without any *roving*, *wheelings*, or *evasions*. I give you this plain Categorical answer, that I exceedingly differ from you, and that upon these two Accounts:

1. Because I neither hold the Doctrine of Justification to be properly of *speculative* concern, but wholly *practical*: nor 2. Do I think it to be so full of *difficulty*, as your very *discouraging* suggestion to your ignorant People imparts. D 2 No

No matter of *Speculation*: For though in all *Practical* knowledge there be some antecedent *contemplation* of the nature and properties of the *End*, or *Object*, yet 'tis the *End* and scope alone, which gives the distinct and proper *denomination*. In *Etbicks* our schollars are taught the natures of moral *acts*, *vertues*, and *felicity* it's selfe; yet we instruct them also that *moral Philosophy* is a *practical*, not a *speculative science*, and that all they know of these matters is to be refer'd and applyed unto the great *practical End*, how they may be morally *happy*, as the Philosopher tells us, *ἡ τελειότης ἀπὸ τοῦ σκοποῦ*; and if he did not, all, that have but the ordinary use of reason, cannot chuse but know. Hence it followes, that *Justification* being at least the *first step* in order to *Eternal Happiness*, the knowledge of this is no more of *speculative concern*, then for a man to know his way *home*, especially when there is but *One way*, and if that be mistaken he is in extreamest danger of *perishing in the way* wherein he goes. Indeed to know the certain number of the *steps* or *paces* between is a *speculative nicety*, but to know his way thither, I am of opinion that every man who has a *home* beleives it to be another thing; aske who comes next. We never enter into the way of life till we are *Justified*, nor can we be *Justified* but in the *way* and method of *Gods own appointment*. All other wayes do but lead us from our *home*.

Nor 2. Is the Doctrine of *Justification* so *high and difficult*, but that the *meanest christian* may understand

derstand it sufficiently to Salvation, so far as words can make it intelligible. And you have done little service to your *weaker* christian (as well as to the great blessed *charter* of Salvation) to perswade them otherwise, and to lead them out of the plain road into woods and mazes, to that ONE Man of *Extraordinary Judgement and clearness*; no body must know what's his *name*, or where he dwells; and so to whirle them about, till you have made them so giddy, they know not whither to goe.

Sr, I understand something at these years (without your *Tutrage*) of the duty both of *Pastors* and *People*. But I know not what you meane to make the way to heaven (reveal'd sufficiently to all, and wherein all are so much concern'd) to be a matter of *high abstruse speculation*, as if none but great schollars, and men of *extraordinary Judgement* could by the right use of the *Scriptures*, and other ordinary common means, be able to find it out, till they have met with that *Elias* who is to solve all doubts; though here (blessed be God) there is no doubt at all, whatever you have ill suggested to the contrary. The earth may send up clouds enough to darken the noon-day sun, but this does not hinder that glorious Creature to be still both the *Fountain of Light*, and the *most visible* of bodies. The *Fancies*, *wits*, *Passions*, and *Interests* of sinful men may put strange colours upon the face of the clearest and most important truth, but when the *paint* is brought to the fire, it melts off in a

moment, to the just reproach of such as dawb'd in
on.

But, Sr, (to deale a little more freely with you)
I cannot well swallow down in the lump what you
would have me and others to do, when you direct
us to prefer that *ONE* man before *the Rulers and
Majority of Votes*, till you acquaint us who that
Gentleman is, and what sort of *Rulers and Majo-
rities* you meane.

And first for the *single Person* (that *Monarch* in
Divinity) to whom we are upon *differences* to make
our *Appeals*, I beseech you, Sr, how shall your *Ign-
orant* or *weaker* Christian be able to Judge of *fit-
ness*? If you thinke he may. I know no reason he
should be disgrac'd for an *Ignorant*. He had need
to have a very competent measure of abilities him-
selfe, who is to give his verdict of anothers, even
so farr as to make him his *super-Dottor* of the Chaire.
Or must he take all upon trust from that *One mans
Fancy of himselfe*, or from others that by many se-
cret invisible *Arts* may be easily induc'd to cry him
up? But this is to make him a meer *Tool*, and to
turn his discerning *faculty* into a mechanisme of
blind Obedience. Perhaps he may be no such *Un-
multis*, a person, in the judgement of the *most knowing
and sober men*, of no more then *ordinary* parts,
learning, or vertues, in all much exceeded by o-
thers, save in the din of his name. He then can-
not be your man, for that seems to be against your
own *hypothesis*.

Next it ought, I thinke, to be well consider'd in a
case

case of so high importance, *quem quibus*; to what Rulers and Majorities this ONE must be prefer'd (and both plainly were my question) A learned intelligent Christian (nay, one of moderate abilities) in a case of Christianity before Heathens, no doubt and little less for a judicious and pious Protestant before a pack'd Synod, or Majority, who hang their eyes upon the lipps of a Pope. But what shall your Ignorant Protestant do? shall one single Protestant judgement in such a case as Justification turn the scale upon the known declar'd judgement of his own Church in conjunction with all the rest of the Reformed? I wish that be no part of your meaning; and if it be, I like not your Balance; your direction (at best) is a crude and dangerous Distate, a Dividing, and not a Curing rule. So you have my Answer to your question.

But, Sir, will you please to gratify me with your positive answer to one of mine, for I despair of solving it my self: you desire me to tell you, whether in earnest I differ from you in your direction, or rule of counsel you have give the ignorant people: and without expecting my Answer one minute, or hearing me speake one syllable for my selfe, I find presently your dreadfull sentence pass'd against me in this killing tone; are you not herein a man singular even to admiration? I am not all Protestants; Protestants, Christians, learned brethren agreed in the Rule. I gave what may be the meaning of this outcry from a person of your veracity, meekness, charity &c. which has almost driven me out from the Society

of men to eat grass with the *wild asses* of the field? why, I must hold, whether I will or no, that a herd of errant *Ignoramus's* is to be prefer'd before *one learned* judicious man, and that too in his own profession, as those that never read *Logick*, before *Aristotle* &c. now let my answer prove what it will, I am condemn'd before hand, *singular even to admiration*. Then I am set a telling I know not what, tell your *schollars*, and the world, p. 48. Tell your *schollars*, you are but one and they are many (which no doubt would be a great piece of newes to them) *ibid*. Then again, tell the world &c. p. 49. Doubtless there is something in that unfortunate (though civil) request of mine, which galls you more then ordinary. For these do not sound like words of *mettle*, but of *paine*, and *Paroxysm*.

But, Sr, will you please to let us walke out a little into the cooler air? (for there is no breathing in this *Stove*.) What is it you would have me tell all these people? why, to this effect (as before), that a child in his *horn-booke* is to be preferred in his judgement of *Latin*, *Greek*, *Hebrew* &c. before the ablest *criticks* of the world in those Languages.

But pray, Sr, may not I be excus'd? whatever I think, it goes against me to tell such stuff to the world, as my own mind and judgement. I would not trumpet my own shame, (whoever do theirs) without a greater cause. I thinke my time may be better employed by minding you that *presses* are a kind of *sacred* things, and ought not to be pro-

fan'd by the passions, interests, weaknesses, or extravagances of men. In private and familiar discourses some greater liberty may be allowed; but he that speaks to the whole world, owes reverence and caution to it, without which every book we publish is little better than a *libel* against our Reader; and even when we court him, we do but entitle him to all the *impertinencies* and *follies* of our pens.

But above all, this can never be minded enough, that if of every idle word, much more slanderous and reviling ones account shall be given in the day of Judgement. Had you minded this (as you ought) you could not have vented those very vain words (I will say no worse) you have done against me up and down this *preface*; as also in the rest of your books where you mention my name.

You have yet a piece of another question, and then it will be high time for us to make an end, and to thinke our readers may have some business besides. 'Tis this, *what mean you to bring in the intimation, Pref. p. 10. that thus the great Truths of God will depend on humane suffrages; even whether God shall be God. Or,* if you have not disus'd your Acquaintance with the latin Tongue, and so mistaken, you might have english'd the words I quote out of *Tertullian* in the like case, with more sincerity. For any one may quickly see, I make not the Divine Existence (as you would have me) an instance of the great Truths of God (though I hope no harme if I did so) but as a consequential dependent, whether it shall be so

or no, upon the subjection of the *word of God* to the *will of man*; especially of *ONE* man, in *opposition* to all others;

Then you would have me to consider whether I do well to *number Artificial, Logical Definitions, controverted by the greatest Divines, with the great Truths of God.*

To which I answer r. That I am asham'd you should thus over and over *expose* your selfe with your most illogical evasion of *logical and artificial* definitions; as if (supposing them true) they were not the same *R^e* with the *definitum*, as I have told you already. Good Sr., talke what you please in private to such as understand not what you say, and let them give you a *Grande Secq^{re}* for your pains: but you may do well to use more civility to the reason of a *schollar*, though he hath not yet worn out his *freshmans* gown.

I absolutely deny what you so rashly avow, that *the definition of justification is controverted by the greatest Divines.* This is one of your liberal *Dictates.* The *Reform'd Divines* are all, I thinke, before your selfe agreed about the *nature of Justification*; its *causes* &c. and consequently cannot differ about the *Definition.* Prove the contrary when you can, and let these poore *Fig-leaves* alone; at least bestow them somewhere else.

The close of your Preface is a *cover* fit for such a *Diss^r*. You tremble not in the audience of God and man to suggest again that hard-fronted *Calumny* (how can any man call it less?) v^z: that I

prefer

prefer a majority of ignorants before a learned man in his own profession ; and thereupon sound your trumpet to this tune, *Is this fit Doctrine, for a Doctor, and a Master of a Literate Society ?* you know not what the event of all this may be : for suppose now being dragg'd in my *scarlet* (a habit more suitable for him that triumphs) at the wheel of your chariot in the view of *all men*, I should happen to be *degraded*, and *turn'd out* of my literate society ; would it not trouble you ? no doubt ; but then it might happen to be too late.

In the meane time, Sr, (without any disparagement to your own *degree*) the name and quality of a DOCTOR and *Master of a Literate Society* might have been treated more civilly by you. And so let that goe along with it's fellowes. For the pleasant speech to my *bearers and schollars*, you put into my mouth at parting, I leave it as divertisement to any that has a mind to be merry upon so sad an occasion : yet one *Atheisme* in it must not be omitted, which fronts it thus ; *Hearers and schollars, this and that is the true definition of Faith and Justification, even of the various sorts of Faith and Justification &c.*

But, Sr, I fear your hast has betrayed your memory, and made you forget that I commend your own definition of faith (*logical or artificial*) with some needful explanations ; and therefore you might at least for my farther encouragement have spar'd me there. As for the bringing *all sorts of* faith into one definition, I confess my disability to do it, but

P. 30.

shall leave it to such as are skill'd in makeing *Definitions* and their *definitums* two *several* things, with whom it will be an easy worke. So for your various definitions of *Justification* *constitutive*, *sentential*, *executive*, in *Foro Dei*, in *Foro conscientia*, &c. one would expect some more then ordinary *sense* a comming by the train and rumble of words which attend it; when indeed all looks like a meet artifice, to set people a *gazing* upon some other matters while you are conveighing your *selfe* with the *question* out of the way.

If it be not so, what need of this heap of *distinctions* here, when you know the question betwixt us is of no other *Justification*; but the *constitutive* in *Foro Dei*, that which makes us righteous in the court of heaven. I have nothing to do with you yet in any else, as your *own conscience* will tell you when you please. If you have not more *justice* and civility for your intelligent Readers, I wish you would show more compassion to your ignorant homagers, and not thus abuse them with your palpable *evasions*.

And now, Sr, if your pen can spare you a few minutes, I thinke you may do well to reflect a little upon what you have done already. You have here and in other places endeavour'd what you could to expose a person who had never been *uncivil* to you, but rather had a fair *respect* for you; and indeed once tooke you for a quite other man, then I have found you now. You have *perverted* the plain sence of questions between us, hid your selfe from the *ignorant* in mists and clouds, and impertinencies of words.

And:

And are such **WORKS** as these the rounds of *Jacob's ladder*? are these your steps and stages to heaven; especially when upon all occasions, and even in this Preface you tell us you are going to the great and *dreadful tribunal*? will you goe out of the world thus? I heartily pray you may not, and hope you will not.

I cannot end without begging the Readers pardon for this trouble I have given him though in my *just and necessary defence*. I know it must needs be tedious to him, which has been so in such a measure to my selfe.

One word more to you, Sr, and I have done. First, if any words have escap'd me, of greater plainness and liberty then I would otherwise have us'd, I desire you would lay your hand upon your breast, and consider what (indeed *unsufferable*) provocations you have given me, by your *odious* representations of me to the world in all the material part of your Preface (such as if they were true I were fit enough to be begg'd for a fool). Your vain triumphs and insultings over me, from nothing but *idle fancies* of your own. Let the equal reader judge between us.

Next, that being now so well acquainted with you, I intend no farther reply to any thing you shall thinke fit to publish against me hereafter, nor indeed to any other upon these controversies; contenting my selfe to have deliver'd my judgement thus far; wherein if you, or any man remain unsatisfied, you may, for me, enjoy your

opinions in peace; resolving to contend with no
man for the small vulgar triumph of the last or
loudest word: yet not despairing, but God in his
time will infuse courage into men of far more a-
bilities than my self to defend his cause. So
wishing you all the happiness (Temporal, and
Eternal) I do to my selfe, I bid you FARE-
WELL.

From my Country-Habitation, Jun. 18.

Prov. 9. 8. 9. Rebuke a wise man, and he will
love thee: Give instruction to a wise man, and
he will be yet wiser.

FINIS.

Errata.

Pag. 13. lin. 10. read effect. pag. 14. lin. 6. read wriggle. pag.
23. lin. 37. read schollars. pag. 27. lin. ult. read imports.



